



New-England
November 1837.

634

Southern Writers on Slavery.

[Nov.,

CAGE

E449

.574

1857 ART. V.—SOUTHERN WRITERS ON SLAVERY—HELPER
AGAINST SLAVERY—STILES AGAINST ANTI-SLAVERY.

The impending Crisis of the South: how to meet it. By HINTON ROWAN HELPER, of North Carolina. New York: Burdick Brothers, 8 Spruce street. 1857.

Modern Reform examined; or The Union of North and South on the subject of Slavery. By JOSEPH C. STILES. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., Nos. 22 and 24, North Fourth street. 1857.

HERE are two books on slavery by Southern authors, but very different in character. One is strenuously against slavery. The other is strenuously against anti-slavery. The one author uses very severe language against voluntary and persistent slaveholders. The other uses very severe language against the opponents of slavery, at least against all whose opposition is active and outspoken. The one declares that slavery is a pernicious evil and an enormous sin. The other, while admitting that slavery is sinful "in the abstract," earnestly contends that in its circumstances here, as it is in this country, (i. e., *American* slavery,) it is not sinful but righteous; averring respecting the white and colored races at the South, that "their present coexistence for good in any other relation, is an exact impossibility." The one insists that both duty and policy require the entire and immediate abolition of slavery; declaring that the "liberation of five millions of "poor white trash" from the second degree of slavery, and of three millions of miserable kidnapped negroes from the first degree, cannot be accomplished too soon." The other, though favoring and expecting its extinction, in the course of the ultimate triumphs of Christianity, contends for its present and its prolonged and indefinite continuance, and deprecates direct effort, especially in the way of discussion, for its removal.



resting on a basis of degradation. Why should they not work together against such a theory, and the practice which it justifies? When united they are strong, and purify one another. Religion, true to its consciousness, no longer afraid to offend seeming friends, can do everything for which it was called into the world. The doctrines of freedom, on their side, no longer betray the outcast by false promises of aid. Religion is seen to be just. Freedom ceases to be factions. Oh, when shall these things be?

We will record, as far as our limited space will permit, the results of our examination of these books, beginning with the volume of Mr. Helper.

Mr. II. is, as he describes himself, "a native of the South, born and bred in North Carolina, of a family whose home has been in the valley of the Yadkin for nearly a century and a half, a Southerner by instinct and by all the influences of thought, habits and kindred, and with the desire and fixed purpose to reside permanently within the limits of the South, and with the expectation of dying there also." For this reason he hopes that his book will be read by his Southern fellow citizens; declaring that he has been moved to write it by "an irrepressibly active desire to do something to elevate the South to an honorable and powerful position," being convinced that Slavery has "impeded its progress and prosperity," has brought its industrial pursuits into comparative insignificance, "sunk a majority of its people in galling poverty and ignorance, rendered a small majority conceited and tyrannical, and driven the rest away from their homes," entailed upon its citizens a humiliating dependence on the free States, and disgraced them in their own souls and before all civilized and enlightened nations.

Mr. Helper declares the plan of his work to be to consider the subject chiefly "with reference to its economic aspects, as regards the whites, not with reference, except in a very slight degree, to its humanitarian or religious aspects," to which, as he thinks, other writers "have done full and timely justice." Of the subject in this department he has made the most complete and effective presentation within our knowledge. It is thorough, reliable, demonstrative, overwhelming. It consists of *facts*, which cannot be denied or gainsayed—facts, derived to a large extent, by careful examination and comparison, from the census, which cannot be suspected of any anti-slavery bias, since it was compiled under the direction of an eminent statistician, who is notorious for his pro-slavery principles and zeal.

Taking the undeniable position, that "less than three quarters of a century ago—say in 1789, for that was about the aver-

age time of the abolition of slavery in the Northern States—the South, with advantages in soil, climate, rivers, harbors, minerals, forests, and indeed almost every other natural resource, began an even race with the North,” he enters upon a comparative estimate of their present condition. Some outline and idea of this we will endeavor to give.

Beginning with agriculture, which is the chief interest and “sole boast” of the South, he finds that in the value of bushel measure products, the North exceeds the South by \$44,782,636; in the value of pound measure products, by \$59,199,108; in the value of farms and domestic animals, by \$1,084,318,059, making a total of \$1,188,299,803. These classes of products our author gives in extensive and elaborate tables, which present the amount and value of the various articles in each of the States.

Of the products of the forests and the subterranean sources of wealth, Mr. Helper has not been able to give any statistical statements. But he says that any one can see on which side the superiority is in these respects, who has ever seen the immense piles of Northern lumber in Southern cities, or who knows that almost all the ship-building, and the manufacture from wood of articles of utility and ornament, are done at the North; that there are far more and better edifices, public and private, at the North than in the South; and that, to say nothing of the gold and quicksilver of California, the iron and coal of Pennsylvania, the copper of Michigan, the lead of Illinois, or the salt of New York, the *marble and free stone quarries of New England* are far more important sources of income than all the subterranean deposits of the slave States.

A table is given by our author of the “actual crops per acre on the average” of wheat, oats, rye, Indian corn, and Irish potatoes, in the various States, from which it appears that Massachusetts produces sixteen bushels of wheat to the acre, Virginia only seven, Pennsylvania fifteen, and Georgia five; Iowa produces thirty-six bushels of oats to the acre, Mississippi only twelve, Rhode Island thirty, and North Carolina ten; Ohio produces twenty-five bushels of rye and Kentucky eleven, Vermont twenty and Tennessee seven, &c. The aver-

age crop per acre of every one of these articles is greater in the free than in the slave States; and, taking them all together, we have the result of two hundred and thirteen bushels as the product of five acres in the North, and one hundred and seventy as the product of five acres in the South.

The great boast of the South, in the line of agricultural products, is its *cotton*. But Mr. Helper proves by the census tables that the single crop of *hay* in the free States exceeds in value the whole crop of cotton in the slave States, added to the value of their other chief staples, tobacco, rice, hay, hemp, and cane sugar. And this he does, allowing the average price given in the census for hay (\$11.20) per ton, which was less than half the average price (\$26.16) at the time of his writing. The value of the hay crop of the free States, at \$11.20 per ton, he finds to be \$142,138,998. The value of the annual crop of cotton, tobacco, rice, hay, hemp, and cane sugar, in the slave States, he finds to be \$138,605,723, leaving a balance in favor of the Northern hay crop of \$3,533,275.

It is often said that the products of the slave States exceed in value those of the free States for the purpose of exportation and foreign trade. But Mr. Helper shows that the exports of the free States in 1855 were \$167,520,693, and the exports of the slave States were 107,480,688. Surely it is time to stop the boastful and arrogant cry that "*cotton is king.*" With more propriety may it be said, as Mr. Helper does say, that "*dried grass, commonly called hay,*" is king.

In 1850, as our author shows, the average value of land per acre was, in the Northern States, \$28.07, in the Northwestern, \$11.39; in the Southern, \$5.34; and in the Southwestern, \$6.26. This difference, considering the numerous natural advantages of the South, is justly ascribed to slavery. Nor is the difference adequately expressed by this general statement. It may be more fairly seen from other statements, which are given in other parts of the book. For instance, South Carolina and New Jersey may be justly compared. Indeed, New Jersey is probably a poorer State by nature than South Carolina. Yet, according to the assessments for the year 1854, the average

value of land per acre in New Jersey was \$28.76, in South Carolina \$1.32! The cause of this great difference, is slavery. So in New York and North Carolina, the average assessed value of land per acre in 1856 was in the former \$36.97, in the latter \$3.06. Such facts speak more impressively than any words can, however eloquent, of the impoverishing effect of slavery.

In addition to his estimates of the various products of the free and slave States, Mr. Helper has a table, which shows their aggregate wealth in real and personal property. We cannot give the details, but will state the result. The entire wealth of the free States is \$4,102,172,108. The entire wealth of the slave States, including the estimated value of the slaves, (1,600,000,000,) is \$2,936,090,737; leaving a balance in favor of the free States of \$1,166,081,371. But there is no fairness in estimating the laborers of the South as property, unless the laborers of the North are estimated in the same way. Mr. Helper rejects, as we do, and as James Madison when the Constitution was formed said he did, what Lord Brougham eloquently calls "the wild and guilty phantasy that man can hold property in man." But if such an estimate should be made, as, for the purpose of comparing it with the estimate of one class of Southern laborers, it might fairly be, it is plain that it would enormously overbalance the valuation of slaves. In a comparative estimate, therefore, of the wealth of the two sections of country, fairness demands that the estimated worth of the slaves as property should be stricken out. This would leave the true wealth of the slave States \$1,336,092,737, and make the balance in favor of the free States \$2,766,081,371.

Our author has a chapter entitled, "Free figures and Slave," in which are many very valuable tabular estimates. We will give a few of the results. Annual products of manufactures in 1850, in the free States, \$842,586,058, in the slave States, \$165,413,027. Cost of railroads in 1855, in the free States, \$538,313,647, in the slave States, \$95,252,581. He might have added that the Southern railroads were built, in large part, by Northern capital and Northern skill. And the same might be said of Southern manufactures. Ca-

nals in 1854 in the free States, 3,682 miles; in the slave States, 1,116 miles. Bank capital in 1855 in the free States, \$230,100,340; in the slave States, \$102,078,946. Postage collected in the free States in 1855, \$4,670,725, and cost of mail service, \$2,608,295; in the Slave states, postage collected, \$1,553,198, and cost of mail service, \$2,385,953. Pupils in public schools, in 1850, in the free States, 2,769,901; in the slave States, 581,861. Public libraries in 1850, in the free States, 3,888,234 volumes; in the slave States, 649,577. Newspapers and periodicals in 1850, in the free States, 334,146,281 copies annually; in the slave States, 81,038,693. Patents issued on new inventions, in the free States, 1,929; in the slave States, 268. Custom-house receipts in 1854, in the free States, \$60,010,489; in the slave States, \$5,136,969. In nine principal commercial cities of the free States, the aggregate wealth, according to assessment, is \$1,572,100,158, and the wealth per capita \$754; in nine principal commercial cities of the slave States, the aggregate wealth, according to assessment, is \$375,862,320, and the wealth per capita, \$477, and this includes slaves.

Mr. Helper speaks of slavery as driving many of the citizens of the South away from their homes. This charge he sustains by a tabular statement, which shows that in 1850 there were in the free States 609,223 natives of the slave States; while in the slave States there were only 205,924 natives of the free States, and that, when the white population of the free States is more than twice that of the slave States. He might have added, that the natives of the slave States in the free States are usually permanent residents; while the natives of free States in the slave States are to a large extent only temporary residents, seeking a competency or a fortune, with which they hope to return to their former home. Of that class from which chiefly is this emigration to the free States, the poor whites, Mr. Helper says, and sustains his opinion by large quotations from Southern writers, and by a liberal statement of pertinent facts, that, "as a general rule they are regarded with less esteem and attention than negroes, and though the condition of the latter is wretched beyond de-

scription, vast numbers of the former are infinitely worse off. A cunningly devised mockery of freedom is guarantied to them, and that is all." * * * * "Never were the poorer classes of a people, and those classes so largely in the majority, and all inhabiting the same country, so basely duped, so adroitly swindled, or so damnably outraged." The severity with which he speaks on this topic shows how deeply the iron has entered his own soul; and a book like this, a direct appeal to non-slaveholders, by one of their own number, proving to them how they are oppressed by slavery, and how easily by their vast numerical majority they may throw off the burden, is a most expressive sign of the times, and may be hopefully regarded "as the beginning of the end."

In this connection it is well to advert to what our author says of the small number of the dominant or slaveholding class. This number is put down in the census as 347,525. Of these, 68,820 hold but one slave each; and 105,683, hold under five each: which two classes constitute a little more than half of the whole number; so that the great body of the slaves are held by 173,022 persons.

But the number stated in the census should be reduced; for it includes, as the superintendent of the census states, "slave-hirers;" and furthermore, he informs us that "where the party owns slaves in different counties, or in different States, he will be entered more than once." The number of non-slaveholding hirers, Mr. Helper has not the means of giving exactly. But, judging from his own town, Salisbury, the capital of Rowan Co., North Carolina, he estimates them at 158,974. The number entered more than once he computes at 2,000. This would leave the number of actual slaveholders in the United States, 186,551. How insignificant the number, for whose benefit this enormous load of oppression on the great body of the people, both negroes and whites, is borne!

Our author has a chapter on "Southern Literature," which is very instructive in its bearing on slavery. We can only make a bare reference to a few of the facts stated. Of the whole number of American authors, as given in Duyckinck's "Cyclopædia of American Literature," four hundred and three

were natives of the North, and only eighty-seven of the South; and of these eighty-seven, many received their education in the North. Of the one hundred and forty-one poets, (men only,) whose names are given in Griswold's "Poets and Poetry of America," seventeen are natives of slave States, and one hundred and twenty-three of the free States. Of the female poets, whose nativity is given in Read's "Female Poets of America," seventeen are natives of slave States, and seventy-three natives of free States. Of the more than three hundred publishinghouses referred to in the "American Publishers' Circular," more than nine-tenths are in the free States, and of the remaining tenth, nearly one-half are in Maryland. A gentleman in Charleston, S. C., is devoting his energies to the preparation of a series of pro-slavery elementary works, consisting of primers, readers, &c., and lo! they are printed, stitched and bound North of "Mason & Dixon's line." Mr. DeBow, the eminent statistician, publishes a Southern Review, purporting to be issued from New Orleans. It is printed and bound in the city of New York.

The cause of this difference is slavery, which produces so much of ignorance and poverty that there are comparatively few to read and pay for literary works of any kind. Mr. Helper states the conditions requisite to a flourishing literature and shows that they are lacking in the South. (1.) Readers. (2.) Mental freedom, of which there can be little in the region of slavery. "A free press is an institution almost unknown at the South. Free speech is treason against slavery." (3.) Mental activity, force and enterprise, which slavery to a great degree prevents. Under the first of these topics a table is given of the proportion of white adults over twenty years of age, who cannot read and write. We will give a specimen. In Connecticut, 1 to every 568; in North Carolina, 1 to every 7. In Vermont, 1 to every 473; in South Carolina, 1 to every 17. But even these statements do not fully represent the disparity caused by slavery, unless it is added that the larger part of those who cannot read and write in the free States are foreigners, while the ignorant of the South are chiefly its native-born citizens. For example, of the 3,607

who cannot read and write in Rhode Island, 2,359 are foreigners, and 68,052 of the 98,722 in the State of New York. In 1837, the Governor of Kentucky said in his message that it appeared by computation that "one-third of the adult population of that State were unable to write their names;" and Gov. Campbell, of Virginia, reported to the legislature of that State, that "of 4,614 applications for marriage license, in 1837, 1,047 were made by men unable to write."

It is often said, as an argument for slavery in the Southern States, that the climate is too hot and unhealthy to permit white men to work there. Negroes only can endure it. This, which, if true, would be an argument for hiring not for enslaving the negroes, Mr. Helper successfully refutes. He gives a table of deaths in proportion to the population in the several States, from which it appears that, leaving out Louisiana and Wisconsin, the ratio of deaths is in the Northern States as 1 to 72.39, and in the Southern as 1 to 74.60. It is even more healthy for whites than for negroes. The average mortality in Charleston for the last six years, as stated by Dr. Nott, is, for negroes, 1 in 44, for whites, 1 in 58. He also gives a table which shows the number of "free white male persons over fifteen years of age, engaged in agricultural and other out-door labor in the slave States." This shows a total of 1,019,020. Of these there are employed, chiefly in agriculture, in Alabama, 67,742; in Mississippi, 50,000; in Texas, 47,000. "Too hot for white men!" he exclaims. "It is not too hot for white *women*." He states that in his own immediate vicinity, not less than thirty young women, non-slaveholding whites, between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five, labor in the fields every summer, and that for twenty-five cents a day.

We now come to Mr. Helper's PLAN FOR ABOLISHING SLAVERY. It is one which is to be accomplished chiefly by the non-slaveholding whites, by that great majority of the people, the millions who for so long a time have been impoverished, oppressed and degraded by slavery, for the benefit of less than two hundred thousand slaveholders. He says, in their name, "We desire peace, not war—justice, not blood. Give us fair

play, secure to us the right of discussion, the freedom of speech, and we will settle the difficulty at the ballot box, not on the battle-ground; by force of reason, not by force of arms. But we are wedded to one purpose, from which no earthly power can ever divorce us. We are determined to abolish slavery at all hazards, in defiance of all the opposition, of whatever nature, which it is possible for the slavocrats to bring against us. Of this they may take due notice, and govern themselves accordingly." The chief features of the plan are these :

"Thorough organization and independent political action on the part of the non-slaveholding whites of the South."

"Ineligibility of slaveholders. Never another vote to the trafficker in human flesh."

"No coöperation with slaveholders in politics; no fellowship with them in religion; no affiliation with them in society."

"No patronage to slaveholding merchants; no guest-ship in slave-waiting hotels; no fees to slaveholding lawyers; no employment of slaveholding physicians; no audience to slaveholding parsons."

"Abrupt discontinuance of subscription to pro-slavery newspapers."

"The greatest possible encouragement to free white labor."

"No more hiring of slaves by non-slaveholders."

"A tax of \$60 on every slaveholder for each and every negro in his possession at the present time, or at any intermediate time between now and the 4th of July, 1863; said money to be applied to the transportation of the blacks to Liberia, to their colonization in Central or South America, or to their comfortable settlement within the boundaries of the United States."

"An additional tax of \$40 per annum to be levied on every slaveholder for each and every negro found in his possession after the 4th of July, 1863; said money to be paid into the hands of the negroes so held in slavery; or, in cases of death, to their next of kin, and to be used by them at their own option."

"If slavery is not totally abolished by the year 1869, the

annual tax ought to be increased from \$40 to \$100; and if it does not then almost immediately disappear under the onus of this increased taxation, the tax ought, in the course of one or two years thereafter, to be augmented to such a degree as will, in harmony with other measures, prove an infallible death-blow to slavery on or before the 4th of July, 1876."

It will be seen that this plan, instead of providing compensation to masters for liberation of the slaves, provides for a small compensation in certain cases from the master to the slaves. Mr. Helper's reasons for this we will give in his own language, as they are condensed into a short paragraph:

"Two hundred and thirty-seven years have the negroes in America been held in inhuman bondage. During the whole of this long period they have toiled unceasingly from the gray of dawn till the dusk of eve, for their cruel task-masters, who have rewarded them with scanty allowances of the most inferior qualities of victuals and clothes, with heartless separations of the tenderest ties of kindred, with epithets, with scoldings, with execrations, and with the lash—and, not unfrequently, with the fatal bludgeon or the more deadly weapon. From the labor of their hands, and from the fruit of their loins, the human-mongers of the South have become wealthy, insolent, corrupt and tyrannical. In reason and in conscience the slaves might claim from their masters a much larger sum than we have proposed to allow them. If they were to demand an equal share of all the property, real and personal, which has been accumulated or produced through their efforts, Heaven, we believe, would recognize them as honest claimants." p. 180.

The idea of compensation to the slaveholders from the non-slaveholding whites, and indeed from any quarter, our author scouts indignantly. And he gives his reasons in very forcible terms. The amount of them is, that the slaveholders, by their selfish and oppressive institutions, have damaged the non-slaveholders far beyond the ability of the injuring party to pay. A part of the account he presents thus. He estimates the *land* owned by non-slaveholders in the slave States, at 331,902,720 acres. This, multiplied by \$22.73, the difference between \$28.07, the average price of land in the Northern States, and \$5.34, the average price of land in the Southern States, gives the result of \$7,544,148,825, the amount of damage to non-slaveholders by slavery, in this one item, land. He rejects with abhorrence the idea of attaching a price to human beings as property; but, supposing it done

for the sake of the argument, and subtracting the estimated value of the slaves, \$1,600,000,000, from the immense debt due to non-slaveholders, there would be still due from the slaveholders, after emancipation, \$5,944,148,825.

This point Mr. Helper illustrates by a piece of personal history. He has recently sold to his brother his interest in the paternal homestead, two hundred acres of very fertile land in the valley of the South Yadkin, for \$5.60 an acre. No one but his brother would give so much. About the same time he read in the Baltimore Sun of the sale of a tract of land of two hundred acres, in southeastern Pennsylvania, not equal in fertility to the two hundred acres of his paternal farm, judging from the description, at \$105.50 per acre. The aggregate value of the one tract is \$21,100: that of the other, \$1.120; the difference, \$19,980—the sum out of which the advocates and retainers of slavery have defrauded his family.

Moreover, Mr. Helper argues that the slaveholders themselves would be more than compensated for emancipation by the increased value of their land. He estimates the land belonging to slaveholders, at 173,024,000 acres. Multiply this by \$5.34, the average value per acre of land in the Southern States, and also by \$28.07, the average price per acre of land in the Northern States—a difference caused by slavery—and subtract the former sum from the latter, and we have \$3,933,535,520, as the probable enhancement of value. From this, deduct the putative value of the slaves, \$1,600,000,000, and there is left as the net profit to slaveholders, of emancipation, on the score of land only, \$2,333,535,520.

Mr. Helper refers in one of the concluding chapters of his book, to the successful abolition of slavery in Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Hampshire, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. He alludes also to the fact that slavery has been abolished, for the most part with good results, in more than forty different parts of the world, within the last half century; and thus shows that it is not an untried and doubtful experiment to which he urges his countrymen, but one whose success has been demonstrated.

In this connection he quotes the following pertinent testi-

mony from a West India planter, Charles Pettyjohn of Barbadoes: "In 1834, I came in possession of 257 slaves, under the laws of England, which required the owner to feed, clothe and furnish them with medical attendance. With this number I cultivated my sugar plantation until the Emancipation Act of August 1st, 1838, when they all became free. I now hire a portion of those slaves, the best and cheapest of course, as you hire men in the United States. The average number which I employ is 100, with whom I cultivate more land at a cheaper rate, and make more produce, than I did with 257 slaves. With my slaves I made from 100 to 180 tons of sugar yearly. With 100 free negroes I think I do badly if I do not annually produce 250 tons."

Mr. Helper has several chapters of *testimony* against slavery, which are valuable not only to aid the argument of his book, but for reference, containing the opinions on slavery of many eminent men of the past and the present, chiefly of the past. One is a chapter on "Southern Testimony," comprising the declarations of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Patrick Henry, Pinkney and many other Southern statesmen, which should make the degenerate Southern statesmen of the present day hang their heads in self-contempt. Another chapter is on "Northern Testimony," another on the "Testimony of the Nations," another on the "Testimony of the Churches," and another on "Bible Testimony."

The chief criticism which we have to make on this very valuable and effective work, is with respect to the severity and harshness of some of its language concerning slaveholders. This detracts from its influence. Yet we must remember that the author writes from an experience of the great disabilities and bitter wrongs which slavery inflicts on non-slaveholding whites, and from long observation of the enormous oppression by which it crushes and tortures multitudes of his fellow men of the negro race—experience and observation which are enough to make "a wise man mad" beyond self-control. It should be borne in mind, also, that he explicitly discriminates between those who are slaveholders of choice and those who are slaveholders unwillingly and with a desire for emancipation. On this point he

says he wishes it "once for all distinctly understood," that in his strictures he has "no reference to any slaveholder who admits the injustice and inhumanity of slavery, and who is not averse to the discussion of measures for its speedy and total extinction." Such slaveholders he considers as only nominally such, and virtually on the anti-slavery side.

We have watched with much interest to see what the defenders and abettors of slavery would say in answer to this book. They have attacked Mr. Helper's private character, charging him with fraudulent dealing in a commercial copartnership—a charge which Mr. Helper has proved, by the certificate of the Southern man with whom he was said to have had the copartnership, to be an unfounded calumny. But they have let the *book* alone very carefully; and very prudently for them. For its arguments are facts which cannot be denied, which can be demonstrated at any time by reference to the census; and facts to which, as they well know, for the credit of their shameful institution and of themselves as its supporters, they had better not call the public attention in any way.

In the early part of this Article we quoted a sentence in which Mr. Helper spoke of the South as his home, and of his desire and fixed purpose to live and die there. But he finds illustrated in his own case the truth of what he had stated in his book, that there is no freedom of speech or freedom of the press in the slave States. His friends at the South have written to him at New York, whither he had gone to publish his book, urging him to keep away from his Southern home, at least for the present, because his *life would not be safe there*. Truly, what a tyranny is this of slavery! There is no tyranny in any despotism in Europe that surpasses it. Legal punishment, allowed and encouraged mob-violence, torture and murder, are the penalty of free speech and free printing on the subject of liberty in the South! And yet North Carolina is called a *free* State. What an absurd misnomer to call *slave* States *free* States! As though freedom and slavery are not direct opposites, utterly contradictory. Not only the negroes, but the whites, have no liberty except

to favor, or do the bidding of the tyrant, slavery; and that is just the liberty which is possessed under any tyranny, however despotic.

It is an instructive fact, and one which should silence those who say that abolitionists are mere theorists who know nothing of the realities of slavery, that some of the most decided and uncompromising abolitionists are from the South, born and bred in the midst of slavery—Helper, Birney, the Grimkes, Vaughan, Bailey, John G. Fee, Cassius M. Clay, and many others; not to speak of Frederick Douglass, Brown, Crafts and others, who have been slaves themselves, and thus know more deeply and thoroughly than any freeman can know, just what the accursed system is.

We turn now to the other book at the head of this article. Its author, Rev. Dr. Stiles, is well known as an earnest and eloquent preacher, of the impulsive and vehement style. His influence, since he came to the North, has been much aided among humane men by the supposed fact that he is at heart a decided anti-slavery man, and that he left the South, partly because he could not tolerate the idea of educating his family in the atmosphere and amid the evil influences of slavery, and partly that he might execute a plan which he had formed for the emancipation of his own slaves. Having given to Dr. Stiles largely of our respect and affection, very much on account of this idea generally entertained concerning him, we have been greatly disappointed and grieved by a perusal of his book. We expected, from what we supposed to be his anti-slavery principles and feelings, that though, under the influence of wounded sectional partialities, he might say some mistaken and severe things of anti-slavery men, yet the main current and force of the book would be against what he must know to be the chief curse and peril of the country, slavery. But we find it to be a vehement, and we are compelled as honest critics to add, an abusive book against anti-slavery men, and in large part such anti-slavery men as the great body of our churches and citizens deservedly honor, and against the

tion that slavery, as it is in the South, or, to use his own language, "*such a state of society* as is common in the South," is sinful. We did expect that, at such a time as this, when the whole Christian world is shocked at the aggressions of slavery in the United States; when it is imprisoning benevolent women for teaching negro children to read; when it is driving our national government to the violation of a time-honored compact, one side of which has long since been complied with, that it may spread its curse over free territory; when it is imposing its curse on a liberty-loving people, the vast majority of a territory, by the votes and the violence of the people of another State; when it is forcing a "facile" executive to take the open position that the constitution, which our liberty-loving fathers formed "to establish justice" and "secure the blessings of liberty," carries slavery everywhere in our territories, and liberty for all men nowhere; when it has compelled the various churches and religious denominations of the South to succumb to its power, apostatize from their ancient testimony against slavery, and contend for its approval by divine authority; when it is compelling Southern Christians with united voice to protest against the publication of the formerly approved and published counsels and exhortations of their own good men on "the duties of masters;" when it is causing Southern divines and churches to recede from a Presbyterian Assembly on account of its moderate anti-slavery action, and then to send to an Assembly of those secessionists a Presbyterian elder, notorious and infamous by his complicity with the horrible torture of two negroes—a member readily accepted, while the minister, who attempted to apply the gospel rule of reproof to him for his crime, was advised to withdraw the papers certifying his membership—we did expect that Dr. Stiles, publishing a book on slavery at such a time, would make its main force bear against slavery, or at least against its recent enormous aggressions and shameful victories over righteous government and Christian fidelity. But no! The tone of the book is that *as a sin, or an evil, slavery is nothing to anti-slavery*. His rebukes are not for slavery, or the enormities which take place under it, but for

anti-slavery and anti-slavery men. And those rebukes are vehement and violent. Slavery should be done away with, he thinks, at some remote period amid the ultimate triumphs of the gospel; but anti-slavery, certainly by any body at the North, or in the form of discussion for slavery's removal, should be done away with at once—nothing but immediate abolition for that.

We are aware that Dr. Stiles says, by way of anticipating this objection, that he is now addressing the North and not the South. But that is the very point of our criticism. Why did he not address the South, when these flagrant enormities, so disgraceful to Southern Christianity, urgently demand it—he who is eminently qualified to address the South, much better certainly than he is to address the North, who can speak to Southern men as a Southern man? Why did he not address the Southern churches, at this time, when their eminent need is to be faithfully addressed on this subject by some one whom they will hear; when their great lack is of *courage* on the part of Christian men and Christian ministers to declare the whole counsel of God—courage to apply the precepts of the gospel to the acknowledged enormities and abuses which occur in the administration of slavery, and also to slavery itself; when the chief difficulty with them is that their ministers and members have been cowed into silence by the overbearing influence and violence of slavebreeders, slave-traders, slaveholders, and their tools the Southern politicians; and not only into silence but into submission, and to a wide extent into conversion to the pro-slavery doctrines of these same breeders, traders and politicians. We submit that with our Dr. Nehemiah Adamses, Dr. Lords, Dr. Bethunes, Dr. Springs, and our New York Observers, Christian Observers, and Journals of Commerce, the North has a sufficiency of the sort we find in this book already, and that Dr. Stiles is “carrying coals to Newcastle,” when they are exceedingly wanted in a part of the country in which he is specially interested.

But to a more particular examination of the book. It professes to treat of “the extreme anti-slavery movement of the day.” This is not very definite: for what is “extreme” to

one is moderate to another, and what is moderate to one, is extreme to another. We thought at first that probably it would prove that the persons in the author's mind were those represented by Mr. Garrison, Mr. Wendell Philips and Rev. Theodore Parker. But we soon found our mistake. He doubtless includes them, but his chief references are to a very different class of men. And these references show whom he has chiefly in mind. He has large reference, for example, to the New School Presbyterian Church, and to the American Home Missionary Society. He speaks of the division of that branch of the Presbyterian Church as one of the effects of this "extreme anti-slavery movement." Of course his strictures are meant for such men as have pressed the subject of slavery on the General Assembly of that church year after year, and accorded with the final action which occasioned the Southern secession—such men as Rev. Drs. Asa D. Smith, Hatfield, Wisner of Lockport, Allen of Lane Seminary, Rev. Albert Barnes, and others—indeed the great body of the Northern members of that General Assembly and of that church. He refers to the recent action of the American Home Missionary Society as one of the developments of this movement. Of course, then, he means not only the Secretaries of that Society, Rev. Dr. Badger and Rev. Messrs. Coe and Noyes, but its Committee, who were unanimous in that action, and of which Dr. Asa D. Smith, Dr. Hatfield, Dr. Storrs and Dr. Thompson are members. He refers to the recent movement, resulting in a direction by the American Tract Society to its Committee to issue suitable publications on slavery, as one of the operations of the extreme anti-slavery spirit. Of course he means such men as favored that movement and decision—such as Dr. Wayland, Dr. Hawes and Judge Williams. He speaks of the persistent discussion, or agitation, of the subject of slavery at the North, as one of the operations of this extreme movement. Of course, then, he means such men as the conductors and writers of the *New Englander*. He evidently intends to include in "the extreme anti-slavery movement" all who are for the immediate abolition of slavery. Of course, he means

such a man as Dr. Wayland. For he says in his work, "If the system [of slavery] be wrong, as we have endeavored to show, if it be at variance with our duty both to God and to man, it must be abandoned. If it be asked when, I ask again, when shall a man begin to cease doing wrong? Is not the answer, *immediately*?"

Having thus ascertained by the references of the book itself whom the author includes in what he calls "the extreme anti-slavery movement," let us see how he treats them. Let us bring before our minds a few representative men, Rev. Dr. Wayland, Rev. Albert Barnes, Rev. Dr. Hawes, Rev. Dr. A. D. Smith, Rev. Professor Allen, for example, and apply to them Dr. Stiles' language. His object is to show in his second chapter, that their spirit is "ARROGANT;" (this is the title in capitals, at the beginning and at the top of the page;) in his third chapter that it is "MALIGNANT;" in his fourth that it is "BELLIGERENT;" in his fifth, that it is "IMPRACTICABLE;" in his sixth, that it is "DESTRUCTIVE." Take some other specimens of his language—"Why our Reformer! He hates the master more than he loves the slave;" "he bears down upon him with a temper as malignant as it is arrogant." In a paragraph in which a direct reference is made to Mr. Barnes and his book on slavery, he says respecting "the Reformer," "In his fanaticism he has taken wrong ground. * * * The Bible, you perceive lies directly across his path. * * * *The Bible must give way.* * * * He affirms first: He who gave man his nature, gave him for his government great '*natural feelings,*' *mighty invincible* 'instincts.' By these as a last resort, he must judge all things. Therefore, if the Bible crosses his instincts, the Bible must be set aside." Then we have this beautiful specimen of ethics and theology, in our author's vehement style. "Wretched delusion! Preposterous argument! I defy any mind on earth to trace out the gulfs which separate the *greater* violence of man's instincts against *God's* invasion of his liberty from the *lesser* violence of his instincts against man's invasion of his liberty! God made man holy and gave him a perfect law. This was justice. God brings me into the world without a solitary remnant of original holiness, and full of all sin, and *yet holds me*

to the same law ! Where is justice now ? He first destroys all my power, and then commands me, under peril of hell, to do as if I had all power ! * * * If now man is to go by his *instincts*, away ! away ! forever with the rectitude of God !” We would ask our author to take breath for a moment, and ask himself how he judges of the “justice” and “rectitude” of God ? He does judge of it, in some way, it seems. In what way ? by what standard ? Any other than his own *sense* of justice and rectitude, given by his Creator ? He then goes on to address the Reformer thus, (we bear in mind that Albert Barnes is the man specially referred to,) “My fellow-man, did you but know what God knows, you would feel that I have a solemn right to exclaim ‘What a *robber* you are !’ Nor is even this the limit of your malice. Behold ! you have embarked me again on that broad and shoreless ocean of doubt and darkness which overwhelmed my race at the fall with no *better bottom* under me than your own wretched, *wretched inferences*. ”

Again, speaking of the Anti-slavery “enterprise,” he says : “Have we not seen that its elements are largely Phariseeism, malevolence, tyranny and prejudice ?” Farther on he assumes an inquisitorial bearing, and says to his “Reform brother,” “I have another solemn interrogatory to address to you just here. How do you feel, my brother, in view of your own conduct in times just gone by ? Did you not *sully your sacred pulpit* ? Under the unhallowed inspiration of the day, by the frequent introduction and fervid enforcement of your secular liberty, did you not soil that holy of holies where God commanded you to speak out to a perishing world, as man’s first, last and best good, his liberty from heaven ? * * * In all this, did you, say ! *Did you quit yourself like a man of God ?*” Then again, after saying, “That you are a Christian man, I have no disposition to question,” he asks, or rather demands, “Does not all the Christianity of your soul sternly affirm, ‘I will have nothing to do with your Abolitionism ?’ On this subject—the subject of slavery—do you find any *humility* in your spirit ? * * * On the contrary, is not *this* your unvarying temper, ‘I *know* that I am right ?’ * * * On this subject, is there any *charity* in your spirit ? * * On the contrary, have you not marked in

your own spirit such an uniformly hard, censorious and uncompromising temper as sometimes surprises you into the soliloquy: 'Why, on this subject of slavery, I hardly know myself.' * * * On this subject have you any *teachableness* in your spirit? * * My Christian brother! Do you know what it is in very truth to struggle with God for light on this subject? * * On the contrary, have you not at times, been more than a little startled at the impracticable self-reliance, intolerance and recklessness which always mark the workings of your spirit on this subject? Have you any *reasonableness* in your spirit on the subject of slavery? What say your *judgments*? * * You hold a sentiment concerning true religion, which in practice profanes the pulpit and abolishes the Bible. You hold a sentiment concerning love to your neighbor which in practice is an exact war of extermination. * * What say your *prayers*? Do they not anxiously beseech the slave's deliverance from those troubles about which God tells him not to trouble himself; while your heart—be your language what it may—(Dr. Stiles, it seems, knows their hearts so well that he can say that their hearts contradict their language!)—is scarce ever conscious of a sincere yearning (!) that the slave might come to possess that spiritual freedom which God says is his all in all! * * Oh, my brother! Does not God know that you have had many secret admonitions from heaven on account of the actings of your soul on the subject of slavery? * * * *Your doctrine is as untrue as your temper is unholy.* * * * Will you take a little advice from me? Daily, for the space of a month, enter thy closet. Bend thy knee. Utter not a word of prayer. Mean to meet God. Tarry in his presence, seeking, expecting light from him alone. Let whatever thought enter thy mind that will. Only be a little child, and long for truth, the very truth of God, be what it may. Peradventure God will have mercy upon thee," &c.

What kind of treatment is this to be given to such men as Dr. Wayland, Dr. Hawes and Rev. Albert Barnes, whom, to present the matter as much in the concrete as possible, we may mention as prominent representatives of the class of Christians whom our author is addressing! We are constrained

to ask what is there in Dr. Stiles which can justify him in assuming such an air of superiority, and such an inquisitorial, condemning, imperious, "overseer"-like bearing toward men, who, to say the least, are his equals in all that commends men to human respect and affection? It must be that in the earnestness and vehemence of his discussion, he has forgotten *where* he is, and that "*plantation manners*" are not suited to intercourse with acknowledged and eminent Christian brethren. "Arrogant," "malignant," "destructive," "Phariseism," "malice," "malevolence," "tyranny," "robber," "your unholy temper," "profanes the pulpit and abolishes the Bible"! Did even Garrison ever apply to Christian men terms more abusive than these? We will not say to Dr. Stiles, as he says to his brethren, "Did you know what *God knows*," but rather, did you know what we know, did you see your own book as we see it, you would be ashamed and repent of its gross violation of the proprieties and decencies of Christian and gentlemanly conduct.

Dr. Stiles' *doctrine* respecting the moral character of slavery does not differ much from the Dr. Ross pattern, and amounts to very little in the way of anti-slavery in "this present world." It is substantially this. *Before Adams' fall*, slavery would have been necessarily sinful; but is not so *since his fall*! He says "Humanity has four grand states. The two last lie in the future—judgment and retribution. The first two have been developed in time—the original constitution of things, and man's fall from it. Our views of slavery, I judge, should vary as we place our stand-point in the first temporal condition of things or the second." * * "The second palpable change (i. e. by the fall) is this. Slavery, so necessarily sinful in the first condition of humanity, may be entirely free from sin in the second." * * "The relation of master and servant (slave) had its origin and *apology* in man's fall."

To be conformed to this doctrine, the language of the Declaration of Independence needs serious modification. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men (were before Adam's fall) created equal, that (before Adam's fall they were) endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that

among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Such a declaration, however, would not have answered the purpose of the patriots of our revolution very well, as they happened to live several thousand years after Adam's fall. Nor can it amount to much as a foundation for a claim to liberty, either republican or personal, in this world anywhere, since all its inhabitants have been under the necessity of deriving their existence from Adam after his fall. It is but fair to state, and we are pleased that we can state it, that sometimes, certainly in one instance, our author says that which is inconsistent with and better than his formal definition on this subject. For example, he says, "On the one hand, slavery, independent of circumstances"—(we do not see very well how this can actually be)—"slavery in the abstract—is both a clear wrong and a great mischief; and consequently *as a natural right* and a most valuable earthly good, we are bound to secure to every *child of Adam* his natural liberty, so far as the end can be effected wisely, quietly, legally." The italics are ours.

Dr. Stiles is in favor of ultimate emancipation. And so we understand Dr. Ross to be; at least he denies that he holds that slavery should be perpetual. Dr. Stiles says "Slavery will be swept away in the progress of the Gospel." But he puts emancipation so far off, that it would not give serious trouble to any slaveholder or slave-trader, however mercenary or avaricious; for he would be sure that slavery would last during more than his life-time. He puts it off at least for several generations. Thus he says: "He, therefore, who conceives that the needed good of this population—*Christianity, cultivation and freedom*," (that is the order of sequence,) "can all be well secured *in one generation*, instead of getting into the privileged period of light and progress, has gone back eighteen hundred years, and resurged in the age which justified faith in miracles." Ah! Give the corrupting, barbarizing, inhumanizing power of slavery opportunity to live and work for generations and ages, and it would more than counteract and nullify all the benevolent processes by which our author would prepare an enslaved race for freedom.

In laying down his fundamental moral position in the early

part of his book, our author makes several logical slips and jumps, which are worthy of notice. He takes this position: "The sinful conduct of men may justify bondage, both temporary and permanent." To illustrate this, he supposes that the passengers of a ship succeed in subduing and bringing to involuntary hard labor for life, under the laws of their country, its captain and crew, who were known to have conspired to kill the passengers and to become pirates on the high sea. This involuntary servitude for crime we admit to be justifiable. But would it be justifiable to enslave the *children* of those pirates for the crime of their parents? Dr. Stiles' position, "The sinful conduct of man may justify bondage, both temporary and permanent," is indefinite and ambiguous. If he means by it, that the sinful conduct of *a man* may justify *his* bondage temporary or permanent, that is true. But if he means by it what he needs to mean, in order to prove, as he was endeavoring to prove, that *American* slavery is not necessarily sinful, viz: that the sinful conduct of a man may justify the enslavement of himself *and his posterity*; or if he means the modern Southern dogma, laid down in Dr. Armstrong's "*Christian doctrine of Slavery*," (What a title!) that the sinful conduct of the human race justifies slavery, or the sinful conduct of some particular race of men justifies the enslavement of them and their posterity—then it is palpably and grossly false. And even if it were true, his *illustration* would prove nothing to his purpose; for it is not pretended that American slavery originated in any such crime on the part of the enslaved as murder and piracy; nor can it be proved that the African race are specially sinful.

"In like manner," (i. e., with the enslavement of that captain and crew for crime,) "the utter incapacity of the subject, in the view of wisdom and benevolence may justify his continuance in a state of involuntary servitude." This is an extraordinary logical leap. Because *crime* may justify slavery, therefore *incapacity* may! But, even if we should take this logical, or rather illogical leap, it avails nothing for the defense of slavery, for it cannot be proved that men, or any races of men, *have* any such incapacity as disqualifies them

for personal freedom, under suitable regulations and government. The doctrine of the Bible and the doctrine of nature and common sense—that all men are brethren, that God hath made them all of one blood—is that all men are so endowed with “capacity” by their Creator, as to have a right, and an inalienable right, to liberty. And even should it be granted that some individuals have an incapacity for liberty, that would not avail for our author’s purpose, the defense of the continuance of *American* slavery, for it would not justify the enslavement of their *children*, since they would not have any such “incapacity,” if they were suitably trained and instructed, especially if, as often happens at the South, they should be of mixed blood.

On this point Dr. Stiles’ positions are palpably inconsistent. He declares that *slave making* is so utterly vicious in its nature, as to be sinful and insufferable under all circumstances. But American slavery, whose continuance he defends, *makes slaves* of all the children of slaves; for they come free from the hand of their Creator. The disgusting legal dogma of American slavery, “*Partus sequitur ventrem*,” is *kidnapping* and “*slave making*” reduced to law—a law which Dr. Stiles virtually approves: for he thinks it folly to suppose that the rightful removal of American slavery can be “secured in one generation.”

Moreover, this position is inconsistent with his doctrine that “the incapacity of the subject” “may justify his continuance” in slavery. For if a man has an incapacity for freedom—is not fit to be and ought not to be free, “in the view of wisdom and benevolence,”—then it is no more sinful to *make* him a slave, than it is to *keep* him a slave. “Wisdom and benevolence” are only putting him in the condition in which he ought to be. We think that the South Carolina advocates for reopening the African slave trade would not ask for any better argument than this of Dr. Stiles about “the incapacity of the subject.” They have no doubt that they can find a plenty of incapable subjects on the African slave coast. And we have no doubt that they can find multitudes there who have more “incapacity” than any who can be found in our slave States.

Our author endeavors to maintain his position of the innocence of slavery, and of its indefinite continuance, from the Bible. But we will not follow him. Suffice it to say, that he has proved nothing new on this point; that he ignores the many anti-slavery Scriptural demonstrations which have been made, and repeats over arguments which have been a thousand times completely refuted—such as that Paul sent back a fugitive slave to his owner, when Paul himself says that he sent him back “*not now as a servant,*”—the law respecting Hebrew servitude, which so far from sustaining American slavery, would utterly abolish it in a few years—the commands to servants to obey their masters; when in the same connection they are told that “*it is thank-worthy, if a man for conscience toward God endures grief, suffering wrongfully,*” and are referred to the example of Christ under his unjust and cruel sufferings; and as though the exhortation to obey masters proved the rightful authority of the master any more than the exhortation, when smitten on the one cheek, to turn the other, proves the rightfulness of violent and unprovoked smiting.

The book abounds in unjust charges against the anti-slavery men whom it addresses, and against the North; made ignorantly, we believe, for we are sure its author would not designedly do injustice, and we perceive that he really does not know the character and practice of those whom he takes it upon himself to rebuke.

He says of them that they “*fight colonization.*” If he knew them, he would know that nine-tenths of them are now, and ever have been, advocates and supporters of the Colonization Society. He says, “*Why is it that he can rarely be persuaded to advance a farthing towards the redemption of a captive at the South?*” Nothing could illustrate better our author’s ignorance of the men he writes about. We can assure him, that it is chiefly by men of this class that the money for the redemption of individuals and families in Southern bondage is contributed. And we can tell him of many persons of this class, who give every year, in this way, as much probably as would be their proportion, if all the people of the country should be taxed according to property or income, for

the redemption of all the slaves in the land. There are many of us who in this way bleed freely for the benefit of the masters, whom Dr. Stiles says we "hate." He says we pray for the natural liberty of the slave, but are not "conscious of a sincere yearning" for his spiritual liberty. This uncharitableness and assumed omniscience in the judgment of our hearts, really deserves no answer. Yet we will meekly assure our author that there is with this class of men more of sincere yearning, and more of prayer, for the slave's spiritual liberty, than for his natural liberty; and that one of their strongest motives to desire and pray for his natural liberty, is that they know that his slavery is a most disastrous barrier to his acquisition of spiritual liberty.

"When emancipation laws forbade the prolongation of slavery at the North, there are living witnesses, who saw the crowds of negroes assembled along the shores of New England and the Middle States, to be shipped to latitudes where their bondage could be perpetuated." This we believe to be destitute of proof; and we know that it is against proof, so far as New England is concerned, with the exception, perhaps, for a period, of Rhode Island. It could not have occurred in Massachusetts; for slavery was abolished there at once, not by "emancipation laws," but by the Bill of Rights, when Massachusetts became a State. It could not have been true in Connecticut; for long before the "emancipation laws" effected the freedom of any slaves, stringent laws were enacted expressly against the selling or transportation of slaves to other States. There is full evidence that the New England States in this matter of emancipation were governed, chiefly, by fidelity to the principles which they had announced in the Declaration of Independence, and by considerations of humanity and religion, and not, as is often alleged, because slavery was *unprofitable*. Why, slavery might be rendered profitable in Connecticut to day, in the only way in which it is profitable in Virginia, viz, by breeding slaves for the southern market.

Dr. Stiles makes a vehement charge against the North of *covetousness*; and declares that consistency requires that those

who claim that slavery should be a matter of Church discipline, should make Northern covetousness a matter of Church discipline. We answer, when Northern covetousness appears in overt acts, so as to be capable of discipline, as Southern covetousness does in overt acts of oppression in connection with slavery, we do make it a matter of discipline.

But Dr. Stiles charges, virtually and expressly, that the sin of covetousness exists at the North in *larger measure than at the South*. This comes with an ill grace from one whose chief employment is to obtain from Northern liberality "Southern Aid"—aid which the South should itself afford. But, coming with good or ill grace, we deny it. That the sin of covetousness exists largely at the North, we admit and lament; but it is unjust to say that it is greater than Southern covetousness, or equal to it. The North far surpasses the South in liberality. This is proved by such facts as this: When Portsmouth, in Virginia, was suffering under the ravages of the yellow fever, it received from the free States \$42,547; and only \$12,182 from all the slave States outside of Virginia, and including Virginia, within whose borders and at whose doors the sufferers were, only \$33,398. It is proved by the comparative receipts from the North and South, of the various Associations of religious benevolence. And it is proved by the testimony of Christian brethren, who have resided long at the South and know as much of the matter as Dr. Stiles does, and who declare that the Southern Churches do not give to any object, not even for their enterprises of home evangelization, any where near as largely in proportion to their ability, as the Northern Churches give. Indeed, one may start from New England and go South, and he will find that habitual liberality to objects of Christian benevolence grows less and less the farther he goes.

Indeed, what is it but Southern covetousness which has produced the great reaction in the Southern community and the shameful apostasy of the Southern Churches, on the subject of slavery; so that now nothing anti-slavery is tolerated there, nor any faithful application of the precepts of the Gospel; so that if Washington or Jefferson should come back to their old homes, unrecognized and unknown, and speak or publish their

former utterances against slavery, they would be hung on the nearest tree? What but Southern covetousness has produced this? We know that Dr. Stiles ascribes this in his book, as many others have done, to the anti-slavery discussion and movements at the North. But this will not bear a moment's examination, in the light of history. Up to a given time anti-slavery and emancipation discussions and testimonies abounded in the South, both in Church and State. Why should they turn right about because they received anti-slavery sympathy and help in the free States? The assigned cause is ridiculously inadequate and contrary to such an effect.

Besides, anti-slavery and abolition discussion, and abolition societies at the North, were no new thing. They had existed from the first formation of the Government. There were abolition societies all over the Northern States. Benjamin Franklin was President of one in Pennsylvania. The late Judge Baldwin, of New Haven, was Secretary of one in Connecticut. Why should this constant cause have all at once a new and different effect? It did not. There was doubtless some extravagance in the Northern discussion and action, which had some effect, but very little, hardly worth taking into the account. The chief cause may be given in one significant word—MAMMON. The introduction of the cotton culture and the improvements in preparing cotton, especially the cotton gin, made it profitable to work slaves on cotton plantations in the more southern States and Territories, and profitable in the more Northern slave States to raise slaves for the Southern market. Slavery appeared differently from what it had done in the eyes of Southern planters, when the produce of cotton fields brought forty cents a pound, and in the eyes of slaveholders in Virginia, Kentucky and North Carolina, who could raise and sell laborers at a thousand dollars each when cotton was high. On this point we quote the authority of Daniel Webster. In his speech on the 7th of March, 1850, he said: "What, then, have been the causes which have created so new a feeling in favor of slavery in the South, which have changed the whole nomenclature of the South on that subject, so that from being thought and described in the terms I have mentioned, and will not repeat, it has now become an institution, a cherished insti-

tution, in that quarter; no evil, no scourge, but a great religious, social, and moral blessing, as I think I have heard it latterly spoken of. I suppose this, sir, is owing to the sudden uprising and rapid growth of the COTTON plantations of the South. So far as any motive, consistent with honor, justice and general judgment could act, it was the Cotton interest that gave a new desire to promote slavery, to spread it, to use its labor." When the great debate on emancipation occurred in the Legislature of Virginia, in 1832, the price of negroes was very low. When the Legislature met the next year, the price of negroes had risen, and the whole subject was dropped. The real cause of this progressive subjugation of the principles and practice of Southern men in Church and State, by the sin of slavery, was *mammon*. It was mammon, the love of money, that did it. Mammon first subdued the politicians; and then mammon and the politicians subdued and perverted the Church and the ministry.

One of the most forcible and eloquent passages of this book, is that in which the author compares natural and spiritual liberty, and reproves his anti-slavery brethren for putting too high an estimate on the former in comparison with the latter. On this point we have two things to say. The first is that we fully agree with him in his exalted estimate of spiritual liberty. We, also, value it far above natural liberty. And this is one of the reasons why we hate slavery, because, to a dreadful extent, it prevents men, masters and slaves, but especially slaves, from obtaining spiritual liberty—introducing so many causes of moral corruption among all classes; keeping the slaves in ignorance and taking away from them the power to search the Scriptures, to read the word of life; depriving them to a disastrous extent of the most common religious privileges; destroying the security of the married relation, and by necessary consequence corrupting their moral purity.

The other remark is this. Dr. Stiles undervalues natural liberty. Let him make the slave's case his own. Let him be treated as many a slave has been, and all are liable to be. Let him be humiliated and tortured, by being tied hand and foot prostrate and naked upon the earth, and lashed till his back is cut into raw flesh; let him have his daughters taken away

from him and sold to corrupt men for the most infamous purposes ; let him be torn away from his wife and all loved associations, and sold on the auctioneer's block for a distant market ; and let him be denied the ability to read God's word, and be plunged into the usual mental darkness of slavery—and we think he would have a very different estimate of natural liberty ; we think he would hardly reprove any who should pray that he might have his natural liberty, as “anxiously beseeching his deliverance from those troubles about which God tells him not to trouble himself.”

It is alleged by anti-slavery men that the whole gospel cannot be preached in the slave States, and that of course only a partial and corrupted Christianity can be cultivated there under the pro-slavery domination. It is a sad and dreadful truth, which we sorrow to repeat, but which, if we would use wise and efficient endeavors to promote *real* Christianity in the land, we must recognize and consider. Dr. Stiles denies this. We affirm it. The *precepts* of the gospel in their *application to slavery*, and especially to the acknowledged sins and corrupt customs and habits which it engenders or helps, *are not and cannot be preached at the South*. We speak advisedly. We have abundant proof of it. Let Dr. Stiles take one specimen. We have before us a letter from a Presbyterian minister in Ohio, a part of which we will give : “I am an anti-slavery man—not from reading Uncle Tom's Cabin, (I never read it,) nor from reading any anti-slavery papers and documents. I seldom read such things. I have a long history of my own that I read, running through forty years of my life—embracing nearly all my life. I was born and educated in Virginia, and lived there until the last four years. I say from my own observation, that if a missionary is sent to the South, he cannot preach (for he dare not) but very few of the truths of the Bible. He can be sent, probably, to no congregation or people in the South, where the following sins will not be rife and rampant. He will have in his congregation—men who hold their own *children* as slaves, and their own slaves as *wives*, although they may have at the same time a *legal white* wife ; men who *sell* their own children ; men who *trade* in slaves ; men who are guilty of great injustice and cruelty to their

slaves ; men who make laws, directly or indirectly, to prevent the slaves from being taught to read, and of course cut him off from access to the Bible. Now a missionary at the South has such sinful practices all around him, and they are the crying sins of the land ; and, so far from being permitted to preach boldly against them, he is not even allowed to pass an oblique hint at such things. If forty years in the South teach me any truths, they are these."

Testimony to the same effect we have in great abundance and variety—it is coming out constantly, as in the case of the infamous Col. Netherland, any notice of whose shocking cruelty by his minister displaced the minister ; while he was left in good and regular standing, and was sent a delegate to a Southern Presbyterian Convention—testimony sufficient thoroughly to convince us that in a large part of the slave States slavery has so far corrupted Christianity, that the gospel cannot be, certainly is not, faithfully preached. This of itself is (and Dr. Stiles acknowledges that, if true, it is) a sufficient reason for the "new rule" of the American Home Missionary Society, against which he argues at such length and so elaborately ; and we may add, it clearly condemns the plan of the Southern Aid Society, in favor of which the latter part of his book is a virtual appeal—the plan to send or sustain missionaries or ministers at the South, who will "preach the gospel" and *ignore slavery*—in other words, preach the gospel with that large part of it *left out* which applies to slavery and its attendant sins.

There are other points in the book which we had intended to notice. But we are making our Article too long. We conclude, therefore, by saying that while, as honest and faithful critics, we have been constrained thus to animadvert upon the errors of our author, and especially upon the manner in which he treats his anti-slavery brethren, we cheerfully say, that the volume contains abundant evidence that he has a warm Christian heart and strong desires for the religious welfare of the Southern people, both slaves and masters ; and contains also many expressions of fraternal and Christian feeling, which we appreciate and reciprocate.

ART. VI.—CRITICAL MISCELLANIES.

I.

DOUBLE NARRATIVE OF THE CREATION IN GENESIS.

THE present division of the Old Testament into chapters originated in the thirteenth century. (See S. Davidson's *Biblical Criticism*, Vol. I, p. 60.) It is a great convenience for the purpose of reference, but justly complained of by critics as sometimes injurious to the sense. If we take the beginning of Genesis, for example, and divide it naturally, i. e., with regard to the style and subject-matter, we shall find that the first section, or larger paragraph, extends to the third verse of chap. ii. inclusive; the second section to the end of chap. iii. This gives us two accounts of the creation; the one in the first section, and the other, which includes an account of the Fall, in the second. The grounds of this division, so far as our present subject is concerned, are principally these:

1. The first section of Genesis, according to our division, has a visible unity, it being the history of seven successive days. The second section has also an unity of its own. The beginning and end of it both refer to the garden of Eden.

2. The second section has a distinct superscription, Gen. 2: 4. Compare similar superscriptions, Gen. 5: 1. 10: 1. 11: 10. 36: 1.; but see also Gen. 10: 20, 31, 32, 36: 30, Ps. 72: 20. Sometimes we find double summaries. See Gen. x. xxxvi.

3. In the first section, the deity is called *Elohim* (God) thirty-five times, and by no other name. In the second section, he is called *Jehovah Elohim* (LORD God) nineteen times, and by no other name, where the writer speaks in his own person. There are three instances in which the woman or serpent speaks, and the deity is called *Elohim*, Gen. 3: 1, 3, 5.

4. We should judge, *humane loqui*, that the writer of the first section had a digested plan before him. Hence a certain

